

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

CLARENCE M. EASTERLING,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 14-CV-1392

DEBRA ADAMS, et al.,

Defendants.

DECISION AND ORDER

Clarence M. Easterling, a Wisconsin state prisoner who is representing himself, filed an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case is currently before the Court on the plaintiff's fourth motion to appoint counsel (ECF No. 81), his motion for an extension of time to respond to the defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 82), and his motion to redact and/or seal an exhibit filed with the defendants' summary judgment materials (ECF No. 83).

On June 15, August 24, and November 9, 2015, the Court denied the plaintiff's motions seeking the appointment of counsel. The plaintiff makes the same arguments he has made in his previous motions. The Court does not believe circumstances have changed such that a different decision is warranted. Nearly all plaintiffs representing themselves would prefer to have counsel; however, there are not enough attorneys willing or able to

handle the large number of cases. This plaintiff in particular has ably represented himself up to this point, and the Court believes he is capable of responding to the defendants' motion for summary judgment. Should this case survive summary judgment, the plaintiff may renew his request for the appointment of counsel.

The plaintiff also filed a motion for an extension of time to respond to the defendants' motion for summary judgment. The plaintiff cites his limited law library access and the complexity of the defendants' arguments. The plaintiff does not specify how much additional time he needs, but the Court believes an extra thirty days should be sufficient.

Finally, the plaintiff asks the Court to seal a particular document that the defendants filed with their summary judgment materials. The document contains the names of minors as well as the contact information of the plaintiff's mother. The Court agrees that this information should not be publicly disclosed. The Court will restrict access to this improperly redacted document to the parties. The defendants shall re-file the document after redacting the information identified in the plaintiff's motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BASED ON THE FOREGOING, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the plaintiff's fourth motion seeking the

Court's assistance in recruiting counsel (ECF No. 81) is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDRED THAT the plaintiff's motion requesting an extension of time to respond to the defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 82) is **GRANTED**. The plaintiff must file his response by **April 19, 2016**.

IT IS ALSO ORDERED THAT the plaintiff's motion requesting that certain information be redacted (ECF No. 83) is **GRANTED**. The Clerk of Court's office shall restrict access of ECF No. 75-2 to the parties. The defendants shall re-file ECF No. 75-2 after redacting the information on page 12 as requested by the plaintiff.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 1st day of March, 2016.

BY THE COURT:


HON. RUDOLPH T. RANDA
U.S. District Judge